

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 11-20 and 23-25 are now pending. Claims 23 and 24 are amended and Claims 21-22 are canceled.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 11-20 have been previously indicated as allowable.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph**

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the feature “coding rates  $R(L)$  based on an Equation (1) in a state in which  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \max-1, \max$  ( $0 < R(1) < R(2) < \dots < R(\max^{-1}) < R(\max) = 1$ )” in claim 22 is not described in the specification to comply with the enablement requirement. In order to overcome this rejection, claim 22 has been canceled and rewritten as new claim 25, and claim 23 has been amended for clarification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, comply with the enablement and written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph**

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the feature “[a] communication device that performs communication using a parity-check matrix generated by varying parity bits in connection with coding rates” in claim 22 is unclear. The Examiner also asserts that the term “max” is not defined in claim 22.

In order to overcome this rejection, claim 22 has been rewritten as claim 25 to recite, "A communication device that performs communications of a codeword between a transmitting device and a receiving device using a parity-check matrix generated... when R(max) denotes non-coding, n denotes..." for clarification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Dennis Powei Chen, Registration No. at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: November 4, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Penny Caudle #46,607  
D. Richard Anderson  
Registration No.: 40439  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000